

| | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Date: | May 5, 2004 | Job Number: | 0315 |
| To: | Department of Transportation Services 650 South King Street, 3rd Floor Honolulu, HI 96813 | Job Name: | Kaimuki Parking Master Plan Study |
| Attention: | Ms. Rae Gee, DTS Project Manager | Subject: | Meeting Notes for Community Mtg. 3 |
| | | Distribution: | |

The following is a summary of the City's meeting with the Kaimuki community on Saturday, February 28, 2004, 8 a.m. in the Lilioukalani Elementary School Cafeteria. The meeting was moderated by Rae Gee (DTS Project Manager) and Ginny Meade Top of the Hill Parking Solutions Coalition (TOHPC).

DISCUSSION:

1. Rae Gee, City Department of Transportation Services project manager, introduced herself to the parking coalition comprised of residents, board members, businesses and area representatives. She indicated this was the third parking master plan meeting with the community. The agenda and handouts were distributed to the audience.
2. Rae announced that the handouts were working documents, to be finalized. Community discussions would be incorporated into the Kaimuki Business District parking master plan. There would be a subsequent meeting to present the findings of the master plan. The following agenda items were noted:
 - a. Introduction of prominent members of the audience (see sign-in sheet), including, Rep. Barbara Marumoto, Councilmember Charles Djou and his aide Francisco Figueiredo, Vision Team Coordinator Leonard Tam, Greater East Honolulu Assn. President (GECHA) Ginny Meade, Mike Abe, Chair of the Neighborhood Board, and Department of Transportation Services Director, Cheryl Soon.
 - b. Introduction of the architect, Urban Works, Inc., including Lorrin Matsunaga and Michael Toma. Lorrin would summarize the history of the previous meetings, including the preferred short-term parking option, while Michael Toma would present the long-term options. Community input would be taken at the end of the long-term option segment.
 - c. Ginny Meade would also discuss related Parking Solutions information after the City's formal presentation.
3. Background of Study and Short-term Parking Options (Lorrin Matsunaga):
 - a. The parking study began last year in September 2003, and the first meeting held in October focused on Lot A and B.
 - b. At the second community meeting, four short-term parking options were presented. All options involved the restriping of both lots to improve circulation. In all options, Lots A and B were separated into two parking areas: a limited area behind the Waialae retail establishments for 1-our short-term metered parking and loading, and the main lot, separated by a landscaped buffer. One-way circulation was introduced to improve the circulation.
 - c. Option 1- Retain metered parking in the main lots.
 - d. Option 2- Retain metered parking in Lot B (smaller lot) and provide attendant parking in larger lot A.
 - e. Option 3- Provide attendant parking in both Lots A and B.
 - f. Option 4- Provide "park and pay" system using smart and debit cards, as well as currency.
 - g. The audience expressed a preference for Option 3 at this meeting.

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

4. Preferred Short-Term Option: Lorrin summarized the preferred short-term parking option:
 - a. Lot A Improvements:
 - o Attendant parking is provided.
 - o Restriping results in additional stalls.
 - o 50 1-hour metered stalls behind the businesses, plus a drop-off area for passengers, and new loading areas for passengers and deliveries
 - o Landscape buffer separating the 1 hour metered parking from the main lot
 - o Main lot has 233 attendant parking spaces (makai side), 1-way circulation, angled parking, two entrances and one attendant pay booth.
 - b. Lot B Improvements:
 - o Attendant parking is provided with restriping and one way circulation.
 - o 20 short-term metered (1 hour) spaces and 92 attendant parking spaces are provided.
 - o The limited parking also separates post office parking from the main attendant parking system.
5. Peripheral Parking within the Kaimuki Business District
 - a. This exercise examined private parking lots within a 5-minute walking radius, equivalent to a .25-mile radius of the municipal parking lots. The purpose of the field work was to determine how many public and private parking spaces are located within the Kaimuki Business district.
 - b. Findings:
 - o Peripheral parking spaces are for employees and customers during business hours.
 - o Bank of Hawaii/Franklin Variety next to Payless parking lots is open to the public. A third lot next to 3660 Waialae Building is a public parking lot.
 - o Waialae lot has 100 spaces of which 75 are open to the public with a 12-hour parking period and priced \$3/eight hour day. In the municipal lots, the cost of feeding the meter is \$4/per day, so this lot is cheaper than the Municipal parking lots.
 - o Total of 760 peripheral parking spaces in the .25-mile radius or study area. There are 111 on-street parking spaces. And 382 parking spaces in Lots A and B. The total number of parking spaces in this quarter mile area is 1253 spaces.
6. Lot A Weekday Parking Demand: Findings
 - a. Lot A Weekday Field Survey was conducted in December 2003.
 - b. Lot A consists of 259 parking spaces.
 - c. Graph indicates there are peaks and valleys in terms of demand. Lot is close to capacity during lunch and dinner hours.
 - d. Long-term parking (yellow) is defined as 3-5 hours period. Gray colored areas are short-term parkers, usually parking 0-3 hours.
 - e. Peak lunchtime hour is at 12 pm and dinnertime peak is at 5 pm. At 5 pm, the number of short-term parkers increases while long-term parkers decline (office workers leave after 5pm.).
 - f. During the day, 50% parkers are long-term parkers, stay in the lots 3-5 hours.
 - g. Average is 114 people parking in lot any time during the day.
 - h. After 5pm, number reduces to 1/3 of people in lot at night are long-term parkers.
7. Lot B Weekday Parking Demand: Findings:
 - a. Focuses on the smaller lot consisting of 108 total parking spaces.
 - b. Demand is displayed as a sine curve with peaks and valleys, with peaks at lunch and dinner times.
 - c. Yellow represents long-term parkers. One third of the lot is filled with long-term, 3 to 5 hour parkers.
 - d. The grey shows parking not always full but busy at peak hours.
8. Existing Parking User Diagram: Weekday Pattern

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

- a. Shows location of the existing 3 hour and 5 hour metered parking in both lots during a typical weekday.
 - b. Typically, 3-hour meters are located close to the buildings surrounding the lots. The 5-hour parking meters are located in middle of the lots and toward the corner of 11th and Harding Avenues.
 - c. Conclusions
 - o People tend to park as close as possible to where they need to go.
 - o Long-term parkers park close to businesses so they can run out and feed their meters.
 - o Employees would prefer to park in a 5-hour stall (to minimize the amount of times you need to feed your meter).
 - o Long-term employee parking takes away parking spaces from potential customers of the Kaimuki businesses.
9. Existing Parking User Diagram: Saturday Pattern
- a. There are fewer long-term parkers in the lot.
 - b. Employee parking goes down on weekends.
 - c. There is more customer parking available on the weekends.
 - d. There is an evenly distributed amount of people parking in both lots A and B on the weekends.
10. Questions from Audience
- Rep. Marumoto: Is there any difference in 3 and 5-hour areas in prices? R. Gee responded that all metered stalls have a common \$.50 per hour rate.
11. Long-term Parking Options (Michael Toma)
- a. Mike first showed a video from CNN news that featured a mechanical parking facility for an apartment building in Hoboken, New Jersey. The news feature said:
 - Robotic or mechanical parking garages are currently operating in Japan and Europe; the Hoboken facility is the first of its kind in the US.
 - No parking lot attendants.
 - Drivers don't enter the parking facility; they get out at the entrance where cars put on automated racks that take the car to different locations in the parking facility.
 - Much of the operations are computer-driven.
 - A customer drives up, swipes an access card reader and a door opens. At Hoboken, the driver exits and the automobile is pulled, raised and maneuvered into a parking space within the 7-level garage. 4 cars can be moved at any one time.
 - To pick up one's car, the customer punches in a PIN number, and in a minute or two you are told which bay or portal that one's car will arrive.
 - 3x as many cars can fit into the same amount of space, as there is no need for circulation ramps or space to open doors between cars.
 - Security concerns are minimized as no one has to walk inside the garage portion.
 - b. Mike presented three long-term options to be located within Lot A, the larger of the two municipal lots: two (2) mechanical parking options and one (1) traditional parking garage options. Within each mechanical parking option, a 3-level scheme and a 5-level scheme were studied to determine the advantages of providing additional parking by going higher. The architect evaluated the impact on the parking lot in terms of bulk, circulation and views, and open space. As a given, all options had to provide at least 100 additional parking spaces.
 - c. Option 1A and 1B (3-story vs. 5-story mechanical parking schemes)
 - o The facility is into the middle behind (makai) the former bowling alley building, and Ewa of the Victoria Inn building. The 3-story scheme (Option 1A) yields 125 stalls additional parking spaces while the 5-story scheme (Option 1B) results in 260 stalls. The community suggested a minimum of 100 additional stalls.
 - o Advantages – Tucked behind the former bowling alley building and was not stuck in the middle of the lot; maintained open space, created a pedestrian alleyway next to the Victoria

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

Inn building. The main advantage was that it maintained the parking lot open space and did not adversely impact the existing circulation.

- o Disadvantages – Gets close to the Victoria Inn Building and blocks views at that building, particularly the 5 story scheme.

d. Option 2A and 2B – Garage in the corner of 11th and Harding Avenues

- Tucked into the Harding/11th Avenue corner of the lot.
- Provides 110 additional stalls with 3-story and 226 additional stalls with a 5-story scheme.
- Advantages - Maintains the parking lot open space and existing parking lot trees; not as bulky as Option 1A and 1B; parking lot circulation is minimally impacted if 11th Avenue driveway near the structure is one-way out.
- Disadvantages – Possible visual impact from Harding and 12th Avenue, though this area is near the freeway and non-residential; doesn't hold as many cars.
- This scheme would be ideal for long-term parkers, in that it is farthest away from the main retail establishments.
- Auto queuing (cars waiting to get into the structure) and its impact on the existing circulation needs to be studied in detail. Queuing is influenced by the efficiency of the mechanical parking structures. Mechanical parking is efficient and would work well for long-term parking, i.e. employee parking.
- The natural tendency for short-term parkers would be to search for regular ground/stall parking first before committing to the mechanical parking structure.

e. Option C – Traditional Split-level Structured Parking

- Takes advantage of the sloping site.
- This option is split level and has 5 levels of parking, resulting in a net increase of 167 stalls.
- Given the 5 levels, this option provides about 100 stalls less than the mechanical parking structure.
- Advantages – Lower cost per stall than mechanical parking; customers are familiar with how it works.
- Disadvantages - Takes up more area; is bulky; affects existing parking lot circulation; reduces the sense of open space in the lot and blocks views in mauka-makai direction. Need 120-foot width so people can drive around configuration, 4 rows of parking and ramping becomes a large structure that fills the parking lot, a big physical impact. A greater part of Lot A would be affected during construction than in comparison to Options 1 and 2.

12. Parking Study Summary to Date

- a. Short-term parking will result in providing 13 stalls from restriping of the municipal lots. However, the restriping and other improvements improve circulation and efficiency within the lots, which is significant.
- b. The peripheral parking inventory identifies 1,250 existing stalls within a variety of private and public parking lots and on-street parking within a quarter mile radius of the municipal lots, including the 382 spaces in Lots A and B.
- c. There are 3 lots open to the public from the inventory study that the community can take advantage of.
- d. The community informed the City that they needed an additional 100 customer parking stalls. The consultant's peripheral parking inventory has found additional spaces that long-term parkers in the municipal lots might potentially use outside of the municipal lots. If businesses can encourage the long-term parkers to go elsewhere, it could potentially free up 100 stalls for visitors and customers at the City lots. This is one option that the community can consider to solve the parking problem.
- e. In addition to finding 100 additional spaces within peripheral lots, the parking study developed long-term parking solutions involving mechanical parking system within the City parking lot (Lot A).
- f. While deserving serious consideration, it is outside the scope of this study to develop parking options at Kaimuki Park and Lilioukalani School and sites on private lands.

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

- g. The long-term parking options located in Lot A included traditional structured parking, but the consensus is that it is too bulky and creates loitering and other security problems.

13. Questions and Comments

- a. Mike Abe, Neighborhood Board No. 4: What is the cost of building a modified structure vs. structured parking?

Response:

- Lorrin: Average cost per stall for mechanical parking is about \$20,000 per stall plus additional cost for exterior façade treatment. Structured parking is about \$22,000 per stall. With mechanical parking, the equipment is expensive but you don't need to build ramps and aisles needed in a traditional parking garage.
- Mike: It is difficult to estimate the cost of mechanical parking and in the end, depending on the façade treatment, it could cost up to \$30,000 per stall.

- b. Unidentified Speaker: The short-term attendant parking option is a great solution. For longer term parking, you should consider tandem parking; Koko Head location is good for this.

- Lorrin: In Lot A, there are about 114 parking spaces taken up by long-term parkers during the weekday. Lot B has 30 parking spaces occupied by long-term parkers during the weekday. Even if they pay their fair share, these spaces could be used by your customers. Eventually long-term options need to be implemented that provide more spaces.
- For the long-term options, the community specifically asked for 100 additional parking spaces. One way is to encourage employees parking in the city lots to park elsewhere, but where do they go? Another option is to building more parking via mechanical parking.

- c. Barbara Marumoto: She is ambivalent toward mechanical parking. She would like to know the cost of the mechanical parking project to the customer. She wondered if the city would consider privatizing the project, having a developer build the facility in exchange for a percentage of the revenues.

Response:

- Cheryl Soon: The City is trying to determine from this study is how many spaces we can get from the short-term and long-term options, what it will cost and how to fund the project.
- If there is consensus from the community to go forward, the City will explore ways to do the project together with a private developer.
- The City's intent is to keep the parking rate at the mechanical structure identical to metered parking (\$.50 per hour).
- In the City's discussions with vendors, the operation of the structure could be kept within that financial cap.

- d. Barbara Marumoto: If construction of a mechanical parking structure requires 12 month of construction, it would impact parking during the Christmas season.

Response:

- Cheryl Soon: If you go back to the inventory diagram, you will see there are public spaces available off-site, and these will help to mitigate construction-parking problems. The City will try to work out an arrangement with the private lots during the construction period.
- Barbara thanked Cheryl and the City for looking at alternative ways to find additional parking, especially the inventory study.

- e. Charles Tang (Sky Valet Mechanical Parking, mechanical parking vendor): He encouraged the audience to go to his company's website www.skyvaletparking.com to learn more about mechanical parking. It was involved with the Hoboken project. Privatization is an excellent idea, and you can do a modular system at the Kaimuki Bowling Alley site. It is more expensive than

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

regular parking, but still cost effective because personnel issues (salaries to attendants) would be eliminated.

- f. Bill Bow, (Longtime resident of Kaimuki and professional engineer): Thinks that the Harding/11th structure may be a problem visually. He prefers the mechanical structure within the lot because it would be more unobtrusive. Curious about the learning curve with the senior customers; wonders if you might have queuing problems while customers are waiting to use it.

His office is located at Market City Shopping Center and the landlord prohibits employees from parking in the lots. If you have a mechanical parking structure, employees could be required or urged to park in the structure while the on-grade parking areas could be set aside for visitors and customers.

Response:

- Cheryl Soon: Employees could be relocated into the parking structure with a monthly rate, and under federal law, it's a pre-tax benefit, for example if you pay \$30 you'll end up paying \$15. In terms of the learning curve, the advantage is there will be metered spaces. They will learn about the parking structure, takes one minute to load the car up, goes quite smoothly. The middle range people will learn from the early bird. One advantage to mechanical parking is that your car doesn't get scratches and dents during the parking operations.
 - Lorrin: It may be human nature for customers to enter the lot and hunt for surface spaces first before using the mechanical parking. Long-term users would naturally gravitate towards the mechanical parking structure. In designing a mechanical parking facility, it would be possible to control the number of exit and entrance portals to fit the time of day or parking demand. It would be an advantage to encourage long-term parkers to use the structure via monthly passes.
- g. Dwight: We need more information from the sales representative of the mechanical parking about how it works, cost of maintenance, etc.

Response:

- Lorrin: One vendor stated that there is a one-minute time period per transaction. Our parking consultant thinks that two minutes per car is more realistic. The options assume a queuing of 1-2 cars per portal, so it would be efficient. In addition, it may be possible, through use of a computer, to add more exit or entry portals in the mornings or afternoons.
 - Dwight: He is in favor of privatizing the design, construction and operation of the parking structure; the City should not get involved.
- h. Jeff Alves: Would the City consider another area? He cited a successful parking garage created at the old Smith-Beretania surface lot where the parking was placed underground, allowing a park to be created on street level. Something similar could be created at Kaimuki Park, and it would not disrupt the park activities. He wanted to know why it was not considered for this project.

Response:

- Lorrin: This is a good idea, and Councilmember Djou also suggested this. However, our study is limited to the municipal parking lot by contract and Council appropriation of the contract. In the future the City could look at the Kaimuki park site as a place for underground parking. Keep in mind though, that if parking is underground, this will affect the existing gym and other existing structures, and the total construction would be a major cost.
 - Cheryl: That idea came up several months after the scope was set, so it was hard adding the work to the project. We would need additional appropriation from City Council to study this.
- i. Bill Bow: Where does the 50% decrease come from?

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

Response:

- Cheryl: There is a federal law that allows employers, should they provide bus or parking passes to employees, to fill out a federal form to qualify for a pre-tax benefit.
- Bill: This could be a method of privatization. At one meeting, the manager of Ben Franklin came and said, why can't you do something at our parking lot in the back, there. So, would that money be available for him to build a structure and privatize the project?
- Cheryl: It's a benefit if you are paying \$40/month for a bus pass, then you can buy it on a pre-tax basis. It's a user benefit.

- j. Dwight: Developing additional parking at Kaimuki Park would ruin it. People who come to Kaimuki head for the park. It is a symbol of Kaimuki.

Response:

Cheryl: The intention would be to build parking below the basketball courts and rebuild the area.

- k. Ginny Meade: An important mission statement for Kaimuki residents to "retain the flavor" of Kaimuki. The park is dear to our heart. A parking option at the park should be carefully considered.
- l. Question from Audience: With the mechanical parking, will there be attendant parking with it? Is there a plan to do a combination?

Response:

Cheryl: Yes, you could do both. You could initiate attendant parking as a short-term solution, and then build mechanical parking within the same lot. You could continue attendant parking in Lot A while the structure is being built. They are not mutually exclusive.

- m. Ginny Meade: I foresee those who are not ready for mechanical parking will continue to use the regular attendant parking in Lot A, then move on to the other lot if they can find ground level parking. If we do attendant parking, will you have a graduated fee for shorter term and longer-term parkers?

Response:

Cheryl: The City has not totally looked at what the fee structure should be. It will have to be set by City Council. The department has taken the position that for now, the fee structure is "as is". The previous efforts by the City tried to create a balance between the long and the short term parkers. The bar graphs indicate that during the intense periods, the lot is out of balance and half the spaces are taken up by the workers. The district has changed over the last 5 years where there are more restaurants (busy period is lunch and dinner), suggesting that some revision is necessary. There is a need to suggest that perhaps long-term parkers can park at the Waialae Lot to alleviate congestion.

- n. Leonard Tam: I would like to see a graduated parking rate. They have this in downtown/Chinatown attendant lots. The City needs to find a way to dissuade employee parking in the long term. I would like to see a 2-3 hours regular rate and an increase in rates from there on. In the long term, has anyone thought about using the Board of Realtor's structure for mechanical parking? It's totally a waste of space and underutilized. That way you can stay clear of the municipal lot.

Response:

Lorin: No, we did not look at the Board of Realtor lot since it's a private lot and we could not look at it. Regarding the rates, our finding indicates that 100 long-term parkers are in the larger lot, have right to be there, and are feeding the meters (not cheating). Initially, our assumption was that they weren't feeding the meters but in reality, we learned that a good majority is paying its fare share. We do need to look at adjusting the rates in order to encourage employees via the

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

rate, to park elsewhere. Our study shows there is a potential of 100 spaces that could be freed up.

- o Patty Osakai-Tsugai (Montsuki): We really need more parking. I like Mechanical Parking Option 1. For short-term, will attendant parking solve the problem and cut down on the long-term parkers in the lots?

Response:

- Lorrin: Restriping adds only a few spaces; however, the lots would be more efficient. The short-term parking options, in working with Walker Parking Consultant, the buffer separates both lots A and B, and limits time from 1 hour and the area provides loading and unloading.
- Patty: How can we make people who park all day realize that we could get more parking? GECHA sent out a letter and it didn't do anything to solve the matter. So what can you recommend?
- Lorrin: This presentation should be made to businesses so they can see graphically that the actual field research...
- Cheryl: The only way we can discourage long-term parkers is what Leonard Tam suggests that we increase the rates gradually with concession parking. This sends the message that you are costing us a customer and you will have to pay more. We like to provide them with alternatives like the Waialae lot to park.

- p. Jay Schallow (Food Pantry/Foodland): We have about 50-100 people parked in the lot 8 hours a day, who work across the street in our building. Majority of the parking lot users are customers and patrons of restaurants, who come for lunch, morning coffee, etc. The residents confront lots of people who park on the streets. We have 250 people in our office building. We try to park outside.

Response:

- Cheryl: Would you ask them to park in the structure?
- Jay: Yes, they know they need more parking and would park in the structured parking, but don't want to pay a higher rate. We'll be happy with that. We appreciate you considering the 100 stalls for people who do park long-term.
- Lorrin: Peripheral parking map shows the largest area with parking is the Waianae Building and the rates there is \$3/per day, very reasonable. It could take away demand for parking by the workers vs. customers.

- q. Barbara Marumoto: The merchants and restaurants should offer their employees monthly parking pass or bus passes but this is money that does not come out of their own pocket (they don't have to pay for parking). The Kaimuki Business and Professional Association. Employees are the ones that park in the critical areas could open up more spaces in the short-term. That would alleviate the short-term problem.

Response:

Rae: There is matrix of inventory and a map that we passed out earlier with the peripheral parking lots that you could share the information with employers and the pre-tax benefit for employees to take advantage of that. Encourage them to use the Waialae lot \$3 a day and \$3 at night. Using the metered lots here cost \$4 a day. You can buy a bus pass, too. It's your job as a representative of your community to share the information that's out there.

- r. Bill Bow: Would like to know the numbers cost per person. \$30,000 construction cost capitalized at 10% comes up with \$250 per month. If we have 50% rebate (lack of better term) \$125 which is a good deal per month for employee. If you feed the meter you pay \$160-\$200 per month. These numbers make sense it's a viable option to look at.
- s. Gordon Tam: I have been in Kaimuki for many years. No one wants to give up his or her private property; I am in favor of the structure at Victoria Inn. It won't disturb the scenery. The biggest

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.

problem is doing it one time. That would cure the biggest problem. Long term parkers are people who work in Kaimuki if they utilize the structured parking it would be fine. If using the meter it won't work.

- t. Jennifer (Hairspray Salon): I wanted to find out about the short-term solution from last time, need to find out when it will be done, how long will it be done, and how much is it costing?

Response:

Cheryl Soon: Attendant would be by RFP and people would bid out that job. We have not started that. After December we have been inundated on new views. I haven't heard from Neighborhood Board, but if we get agreeable on consensus basis we can start trying to do an RFP for it. In terms of the striping we do have the money for that.

- u. Terry Toguchi: Where can I get those federal forms you are talking about? I manage the post office property and this would help the employees. Many businesses should be notified.
- v. Ginny Meade: GECHA is very interested in working with the business community and would like to help get and disseminate the information. Let's do a good presentation and distribute it everywhere, I'm happy to see you interested.

Rae Gee closed the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Should you have any questions or comments to the above meeting notes, please do not hesitate to call us at 597-1155. Thank you.



Lorrin Matsunaga, AIA
Principal

cc: Tom Soo Hoo, Walker Parking Consultants

Unless written revisions are received within seven days, we shall assume the statements contained herein are accepted.